DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 243 314 FL 014 337

AUTHOR Hinds, John; Tomiyama, Machiko
TITLE Transfer Versus Developmental Errors in Second Language Acquisition.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (18th, Houston, TX, March 6-11, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS English (Second Language); Evaluative Thinking; *Interference (Language); Language Research; Literature Reviews; Opinions; Research Methodology; *Research Problems; *Second Language Learning; *Transfer of Training

ABSTRACT

The concept of language transfer as discussed in Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's book, "Language Two," is critically examined. It is suggested that the work's major thesis, that language transfer, or interference, is relatively low for second language acquisition, is unproven. A survey of the research reports cited to support this claim showed that the authors of the book had (1) used articles containing faulty analyses, (2) misrepresented the claims of certain articles, and (3) incorrectly interpreted research results. In some cases, the results cited as similar were not comparable because of differing research definitions, that quotations were taken out of context or given new interpretations, and that some evidence cited as conclusive can also be interpreted as ambiguous. It is proposed, based on this review, that there is no unambiguous support in the literature cited by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen to substantiate the claim of limited language transfer in second language acquisition. A brief survey of research reports that promise to provide insight into the process of second language acquisition concludes the review. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED243314

FL014337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Hinds
Machiko Tomiyama
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Transfer versus developmental errors in second language acquisition

John Hinds and Machiko Tomiyama
Center for English as a Second Language
Pennsylvania State University
March 1984

This paper examines critically the concept of language transfer as discussed in Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's (DBK's) Language Two. We claim that their major thesis, that language transfer is relatively low for second language acquisition, is unproven. In a survey of research reports cited by DBK to support their claim, we find that DBK have (1) used articles which contain faulty analyses, (2) misrepresented the claims of certain articles, and (3) have incorrectly interpreted research results. We therefore find that there is no unambiguous support in the literature cited by DBK to substantiate their claim with respect to the effect of language transfer on second language acquisition. We conclude with a brief survey of research reports which give promise of providing insight into the process of second language acquisition.

A major concern of the audience to whom second language acquisition research is addressed is the veridicality of the reports they read. Frequently reports are based on languages the reader

does not know at all, on statistical procedures the reader is unfamiliar with, or on materials not available for examination. In these cases the reader must either accept the author's findings uncritically, or must rely on other researchers who are willing and able to evaluate critically the author's position.

It is from this perspective that we offer a critical commentary Language Two by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, in particular, Chapter 5, "The role of the first language". We began our investigation through an interest in the role of transfer in second language acquisition, and were intrigued by the following quotation (p. 96):

> Despite a long history of assumption to the contrary, present research results suggest that the major impact the first language has on second language acquisition may have to do with accent, not with grammar or syntax.

We found that we fit in very nicely with that long line of assumers who felt that transfer, or interference, has a major impact on the acquisition of L2 grammar or syntax. Example after example come to mind of L2 errors which looked to us like transfer errors. Only two general types of error are presented here.

1. English speakers when learning Japanese frequently confuse, or fail to use correctly, such transitive-intransitive verb forms as kowasu "to break (something)" and kowareru "(something) breaks".

This we attributed to the fact that English does not have transitive-intransitive pairs of verbs.

2. Korean learners of Japanese often incorrectly use the

sentence final particle yo, the function of which is to add emphasis to a sentence, much like the English tag expression "you know". Korean speakers do this, we thought, because there is a sentence final particle yo in Korean, but this particle in Korean is a politeness marker. In attempting to be polite, Korean speakers sound emphatic.

We were thus pleased to see that Dulay, Burt, and Krashen had not only surveyed the relevant literature, but they were able to provide solid statistical evidence for the minimal role of transfer of grammar in adult second language acquisition. They state (p. 102):

> In the area of grammar, including syntax and morphology, the incidence of errors that are traceable to characteristics in the first language is relatively low--around 4% to 12% for children, and from 8% to 23% for adults. Of these interlingual errors, most tend to be limited to word order and are not made in the morphology of the language.

We discovered then that only between 8% and 23% of L2 errors made by adults are attributable to a carry-over from the first language. Moreover, we found that most of these errors are limited to word order. Very few transfer errors can be found in the morphology of the language.

We wondered, of course, how percentages could be assigned to something as elusive as error types. Obviously, we were not alone in this doubt about quantifying errors since of seventeen articles

examined by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, only three used any percentages at all. Moreover, of those three articles which did indicate percentages, we found none to be mutually comparable since they do not define the terms transfer error and developmental error in the same way.

So, despite Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's precision of statement, we were still somewhat skeptical of their conclusion. We determined then that it would be in our best interest to examine carefully the research reports that Dulay, Burt, and Krashen had referred to, and to determine for ourselves if the research supported their conclusion.

A cursory reading of the materials confounded us, because we did not find the overwhelming support suggested by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen. In fact, to go immediately to our conclusion, we found that none of the references cited by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen gave unambiguous support to their claim that transfer errors account for only 8% to 23% of all adult L2 errors, or 4% to 12% of children's.

We encountered four different types of problems with the literature Dulay, Burt, and Krashen cite. The first problem is in defining what is meant by transfer, or interference. Not all of the articles define these terms, and it is not always clear that each author was working with the same unstated definition. The second problem was that some of the articles were not very good. For instance, they discuss transfer, or lack of transfer, based on an incorrect analysis of either the target language or the native language. A misunderstanding of how the native language is struc-

tured might lead to the fallacious conclusion that there is no transfer. A correct understanding of the native language structure could very well lead to the opposite conclusion, that transfer does exist. The third problem was that Dulay, Burt, and Krashen misrepresent the spirit of certain articles by taking quotations out of context, or by making interpretations the original authors never made. The fourth problem, and perhaps the most difficult for us to represent fairly, is that we have serious differences of opinion with Dulay, Burt, and Krashen as to how to interpret certain articles. Articles which provide clearcut evidence against the existence of transfer for Dulay, Burt, and Krashen to us are ambiguous.

Our major purpose in this paper then is to examine critically the claim of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen that transfer accounts for very little of L2 errors. We do not wish to claim, of course, that transfer accounts for all errors, or even that transfer accounts for most errors, because we see that developmental factors such as overgeneralization play an important role in the process of gaining fluency in a second language. We also do not wish to give the impression that we are alone in attempting to determine the proper place of transfer in the theory of second language acquisition. The recent publication of the volume Language Transfer in Language Learning edited by Susan Gass and Larry Selinker gives ample evidence of the robustness of this line of inquiry. Rather, we are concerned with assuring that the claims made in one very influential book are held up to close scrutiny. To this end, we begin with a discussion of the term "transfer".

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen state that they avoid the use of the word transfer, except

> in the context of the theoretical constructs of "negative transfer" or "positive transfer", two terms that are clearly associated with their technical definition from habit theory in psychology. Errors that reflect the leaner's first language structure have been labelled "interlingual errors".

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen specifically define interlingual errors as L2 errors that reflect native language structure regardless of the internal process or external conditions that spawned them. This they contrast with developmental errors, which for them are those errors which are similar to those made by children learning the target language as a first language.

We do not have the concern that Dulay, Burt, and Krashen have with the term negative transfer, and so we will use it synonymously with their term interlingual error.

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen list four aspects of L2 learner's verbal performance.

1. grammatical errors
2. non-use of L1 rules similar in L2
3. judgments of grammatical correctness
4. avoidance

For us, the only measure that can be productively quantified is that involving grammatical errors. To that end, we define transfer, with Gass (1983):70, to be the imposition of a previously learned pattern onto a new learning situation. Specifi-

cally,

> language transfer is ... considered as a subset of this more general process, incorporating the view that patterns of the native language (of all levels of linguistic structure), including both forms and functions of elements, are superimposed on the patterns learned in a second language.

This definition has been developed from Selinker's (1966:103) operational definition of language transfer as a:

> process occurring from the native to the foreign language if frequency analysis shows that a statistically significant trend in the speaker's native language ... is then paralleled by a significant trend toward the 'same' alternative in the the speaker's attempted production of the foreign language sentences, phonetic features, phonetic sequences, etc.

We turn now to an analysis of the articles examined by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen. They examined seventeen articles in Chapter 5, and these are listed in Chart 1.

Chart 1 Examination of Articles on Grammatical Errors (Chapter 5)

	Author(s)	Population	Date of Pub.	L1	L2	Do they report percentages?	Do they claim or imply that DE's are more important than TE's?	If yes, do they present evidence to minimize the importance of TE's?	Does the article support D, B & K's hypothesis?	Types of Problems
1.	Dulay & Burt	child	1974a	Spanish	English	YES (D:87% T:5%)	YES	NO	NO	F, I
2.	Milon	child	1974	Japanese	English	N/A	YES	NO	NO	F, I
3.	Gillis & Weber	child	1976	Japanese	English	N/A	YES	NO	NO	F, I
4.	Gonzalez & Elijah	child	1979	Spanish	English	YES* (T: 12%)	YES	NO	NO	D, F, I
5.	Ervin-Tripp	child	1974	English	French	NO	YES	NO	NO	F, I
6.	d'Angeljan & Tucker	adult	1975	French	English	N/A	YES	NO	NO	F, I
7.	Hansen-Bede	child	1975	English	Urdu	N/A	YES NO	NO N/A	NO	I
8.	Wode	child	1976	German English	English German	N/A	NO	N/A	NO	M
9.	White	adult	1977	Spanish	English	YES (D:60% T:21%)	NO	N/A	NO	M
10.	Lococo	adult	1975	English	Spanish German	YES**	NO	N/A	NO	M
11.	Lococo	adult	1976	English	Spanish	YES***	NO	N/A	NO	M
12.	Hanania & Gradman	adult	1977	Arabic	English	N/A	NO	N/A	NO	M
13.	Scott & Tucker	adult	1974	Arabic	English	YES****	NO	N/A	NO	M
14.	Valdman	adult	1974	English	French	N/A	NO	N/A	NO	M
15.	Price	child	1968	English	Welsh	N/A	NO	N/A	NO	M
16.	Boyd	child	1975	English	Spanish	not available				
17.	Venable	adult	1974	Greek French	English	not available				

* No percentage reported for developmental errors
** See Chart 4 for percentages broken down by Sample and TL
*** Percentages differ depending on types of task
**** Percentages differ depending on types of task and grammatical items

Types of Problems
D: definition of transfer
F: faulty analysis
M: misrepresented by DBK
I: interpretation differences

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We have listed a number of objective facts about each article: the title, the author(s), the population, the date of publication, the native language, the target language, whether percentages are reported, and whether the authors claim that developmental errors are more important than transfer errors. We then list three subjective observations. First, in the event that the authors claim that developmental errors are more important than transfer errors, whether convincing evidence is presented to minimize the importance of transfer errors. Second, whether the article supports Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's hypothesis that transfer errors play a minimal role in second language acquisition. Third, the reason(s) the article does not unambiguously support Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's position.

Four articles were unavailable to us. Of these, three clearly deal with child second language acquisition. The fourth, by Valdman, appears to deal with pedagogy.

Of the articles which were available to us, we found several which contained flawed analyses of the first language, and we believe that these incorrect analyses vitiate any claims that are made. As an example of this, we will examine in detail the article by Gillis and Weber (1976), since they see their work as contributing to the position that first and second language acquisition are similar.

Gillis and Weber conduct a five-month longitudinal study of two Japanese boys aged 6;11 and 7;6. Both boys had been in Canada for more than four months when the study began. The data consist of some thirty hours of taped sessions in which one of the authors

spoke with the boys. Three aspects of English acquisition were examined: negation, interrogatives, and imperatives.

There are many difficulties with this article. First, Gillis and Weber demonstrate that they know very little about the structure of Japanese, and so we do not believe they could recognize transfer if it were present. Second, there is not enough data presented in the article for the reader to draw individual conclusions. This is especially important since most of the few examples they present appear to be possible instances of transfer.

Gillis and Weber (1976:86) discuss negation in Japanese and state:

> Negation in Japanese, although semantically complex, is sytactically transparent. The negative particle [sic] occurs finally in the sentence ... and there are no transformations that change the place of a negative particle ...

Negation is a relatively simple process in Japanese, although it is certainly not as simple as Gillis and Weber suggest. Therefore, any simplification of forms in English negation could as easily be attributed to transfer as to a developmental process like overgeneralization. A more important matter, however, is that the complexities of negation in Japanese exist in the area of semantics, rather than syntax. There are four negative forms in Japanese, each with its own range of meaning:

Table 1

Function	Form
Rejection/refusal	iya
Prohibition	dame
Non-existence	(i)nai
Denial	chigau

[adapted from Clancy (1983):29]

Unfortunately Gillis and Weber provide no data which would indicate whether these functions are being transferred. Gillis and Weber therefore do not examine the precise area in which transfer might exist. Even in the area they did examine, however, there are difficulties with the conclusion that the boys exhibit some type of universal developmental strategy since the two boys did not show the same developmental pattern. Thus, although Akio's development of negation appeared to be "just about identical" to that of English speaking children, Haruo's did not.

With respect to interrogatives, the data are inadequate to draw conclusions. In a more sophisticated analysis of interrogatives in Japanese first language acquisition, Clancy (1983:56ff) has stated:

> Since there is such extensive ellipsis in Japanese conversation, the form of questions can be extremely simple, and children's earliest one-word questions, such as nani? 'what?' meaning 'what is this?' are actually grammatically complete and correct in casual conversational style. In essence, Japanese presents the child with a language in which it would be very difficult to make a mistake in forming a question.

This observation may be reflected by the fact that Gillis and Weber are forced to modify the rules Klima and Bellugi have developed for first language acquisition in a very interesting way. These rules, wh-preposing, interrogative inversion, and do-insertion, are all obligatory for English. Gillis and Weber declare them to be optional for one of their subjects. Since Japanese

does not require movement of elements and allows for the free ellipsis of items in questions, it is possible that negative interference is operating to prevent errorless production.

Finally, with respect to imperatives, it appears that the children in this study make no formal mistakes. Gillis and Weber look for evidence of transfer from a feature they believe to be part of a male Japanese child's speech, the gerund followed by the politeness marker nasai. Unfortunately, this form is rarely, if ever, used by male Japanese children.

In sum, we believe quite strongly that this article is too flawed to be used as support for Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's position.

Another criticism of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen that we have is that they have misrepresented a number of articles to support their claim that transfer errors are minimal. They claim, for instance, that LoCoco (1975), a study involving the learning of Spanish and German by English speaking college students, provides the following percentages of different error types. These are taken from p. 188 in Language Two, and are presented in Chart 2:

Chart 2

	Spanish		German	
	Transfer	Developmental	Transfer	Developmental
Sample 1	11.5	63.4	23.0	70.6
Sample 2	14.7	63.6	12.4	76.1
Sample 3	11.7	67.8	18.6	71.6
Sample 4	14.9	62.3	16.4	74.3
MEAN	15.4%		68.7%	

In order to derive this chart, Dulay, Burt, and Krashen have reanalyzed LoCoco's article. They have not only misanalyzed the data LoCoco presents, they have seriously misrepresented LoCoco's major claim. LoCoco has identified six types of errors, presented in Chart 3 with brief explanations:

Chart 3

Interlingual error:	L1 has a rule which L2 does not have and the L1 rule is applied to L2.
Intralingual error:	L1 does not have a rule which L2 has; the learner applies L2 to produce an error.
Dual error:	L1 does not have a rule which L2 has, and no rule is applied in L2. These errors represent a simplification which is modelled after the mother tongue.
Lack of transfer error:	L1 and L2 have the same rule, and the rule is not applied in L2.
Communicative error:	the learner attempts to use a structure or word form whose lexical, semantic, and functional characteristics had not been taught in the classroom.
Overlap error:	those which could derive from two or more sources.

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (p. 187-8) state:

> In order to allow comparability across studies, the subcategories are collapsed as follows: (a) Lack of transfer, intralingual, and communicative collapse into Developmental, (b) Interlingual remains as is; and (c) Dual and Overlap collapse into Ambiguous.

Given the definitions LoCoco provides, this collapsing of categories is incorrect. Intralingual errors are not developmental errors. LoCoco's example demonstrates this clearly:

> L1: no adjective and noun agreement rule
>
> I2: adjectives and nouns agree in gender and number
>
> Learner's language: ninos buena, grosse Häuser

We have defined transfer as the imposition of a pattern of the native language which is superimposed on the pattern learned in a second language. "No adjective and noun agreement" is a pattern. This "no agreement" pattern is superimposed on the learner's language.

The second type of error Dulay, Burt, and Krashen make is that they average the German and Spanish results to get percentages, despite the fact that LoCoco states that the target language makes a difference in percentage of error type. She states:

> the results of this study also show that it is not possible to formulate generalizations about the frequency of types of errors based on the findings of research on only one target language and at only one stage of learning.

We have recalculated LoCoco's figures by collapsing interlin-

qual and intralingual errors into a single category. We therefore arrive at the following percentages, presented in Chart 4. Percentages are for the four samples that LoCoco collected. We wish to state that our recalculations are as invalid as Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's. We perform this exercise only to demonstrate the ease with which firm figures can be used to support a position, even if the rationale for such figures is dubious.

Chart 4

	Spanish		German	
	Transfer	Developmental	Transfer	Developmental
Sample 1	43.4	31.5	81.6	12.0
Sample 2	55.0	23.3	71.0	17.5
Sample 3	55.9	23.6	79.8	10.4
Sample 4	56.7	9.7	72.3	18.4

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen also claim that LoCoco noted 25% of the German subjects contributed to the higher values obtained for interlingual errors. However, LoCoco did not claim that these were interlingual errors, but that they were communicative errors. She never claimed that interlingual errors and communicative errors are the same.

Finally, the thrust of LoCoco's article may be summed up in her own words (p. 115):

> The hierarchies that were established confirmed the error dependency on three major factors: the mother-tongue, the target language and the input. Mother-tongue interference was found to be high in German but low in Spanish. Thus, the incidence of mother-tongue interference appears to be influenced by an interaction of L1 and L2. Upon looking at the results obtained for German, the claim that mother-tongue interference is minimal in L2 acquisition seems unwarranted. On the other hand, the results obtained for Spanish would confirm such a claim. However, even in Spanish, it would be invalidated by sample 4; which indicated the importance of taking the stage of learning into account.

Given this conclusion, it is difficult to understand how Dulay, Burt, and Krashen could have used LoCoco to support their hypothesis that transfer errors account for 8% to 23% of all adult syntactic errors.

Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's treatment of an article by L. White (1977) also contains serious misrepresentations of the author's

position. White's study discusses error analysis and error correction in adult learners of English as a second language. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen attempt to minimize the 20.6% figure for transfer errors that White reports. They state (p. 186):

> It is interesting to note that the bulk of the interlingual errors are in two categories: _It-be-X_ and _Possessive_. White notes that nearly all (37 out of 43) of the _It-be-X_ errors were of the sort _is X_, where _it_ was apparently omitted. In that regard, she mentions that Cancino et al (1975) noticed the same phenomenon and have persuasively argued that the _is X_ error may be one of pronunciation rather than of grammar. Cancino et al. suggest that the pronunciation of _it's_ and _is_ by Spanish speakers learning English may not be distinguishable to the listener, i.e. it may be an unanalyzed chunk. An imitation experiment they conducted shows that their Spanish speakers did not make the distinction in their speech. If the _is X_ error is indeed a phonological error, as the data suggest, the proportion of grammatical interlingual errors in White's study drops from 20.6% to 12.4%.

This passage by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen is alarming since one of the purposes of White's study was to determine whether this error is phonological or syntactic. White in fact concludes that it is a syntactic error, not a phonological one. She states (p. 53):

> The final point investigated in this experiment was the

type of interference occurring in the "Is X structure." If "Is X" derives from phonological similarity to "Es X", then one might expect that the subjects would be able to correct their error when confronted with it in writing, since they are no longer working with the sounds involved, so that phonological interference should not occur. However, only half the "Is X" structures were corrected, suggesting true syntactic interference from Spanish, were subject pronoun omission is permitted in unambiguous cases. Also the theory of phonological interference from "Es X" cannot explain the omission of "he," "she," or "they," which also occurs, though much less frequently that "it" omission. It appears that the omission of any pronoun subject is due to the same cause, namely syntactic interference from Spanish.

Again, we cannot understand how this study could have been used to support the hypothesis of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen.

Dulay and Burt (1974a) provide percentages of developmental and transfer errors committed by 179 Spanish speaking children between the ages of 5 and 8. Dulay and Burt were concerned with whether the errors committed by these children were transfer or developmental. They determined 513 unambiguous errors, errors which were clearly developmental or transfer. They analyzed these errors and found that they were all classifiable as one of six syntactic structures. They found that only 4.7% of the errors made by these subjects reflected native Spanish interference, and

that 87.1% reflected the same developmental structures used by children learning English as a first language.

These percentages certainly suggest a minimal role for language transfer. There are several problems with their analysis, however, which tend to undermine their findings. The central role that this article plays in the formulation of percentages necessitates a critical look at the methodology.

The shortcomings of Dulay and Burt's approach to the study of second language acquisition have been discussed in the literature [see, in particular, Huebner (1983), White (1977)]. We wish only to suggest a number of questions which are not answered, and which weigh against their conclusion.

First, we do not know anything about the subjects except their ages and native language. We do not know their prior exposure to English, their current linguistic environment, or their general level of English language ability.

Second, we must rely on Dulay and Burt's judgment of the errors. There are no data in this article, except for example sentences, which the reader can evaluate. Is it the case that Dulay and Burt have correctly characterized each error type?

Third, the actual number of unambiguous errors translates to less than three errors per subject. Is this an indication of language ability or a reflection of the data gathering techniques?

Related to this is the fact that only six syntactic structures have been identified as containing errors. Give a robust data set, we would imagine a larger variety of error types. Again, is this a reflection of the data gathering techniques?

The anaysis presented by Dulay and Burt raises some serious methodological issues. We will thus turn from our largely negative remarks to suggest ways in which fruitful investigations into the role of transfer have been conducted. We will do this by discussing a number of recent studies which give promise of providing valid findings.

One such study is represented by Huebner (1979), (1983). Huebner performed a longitudinal study of the acquisition of English by a 23-year old male Hmong refugee who was learning English in Hawaii. Huebner demonstrates that an analysis which focuses on the order of acquisition of morphemes as determined by their appearance in obligatory contexts, as in Dulay and Burt (1974b), will fail to recognize the systematic use of English functors before they acquire Standard English functions. In particular, Huebner (1979) investigates the distribution of the articles da, a, and Ø in four environments. He finds that the distribution of these forms over the course of a year is systematic, and that this distribution is related to the gradual shift of his subject's interlanguage from topic-prominence to subject-prominence.

The reason Huebner's study is so important is that it shows conclusively that the measurement of language acquisition requires more than the mere tabulation of appearance of functors in obligatory contexts. Obligatory context studies, on which most of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's percentages are based, are quite unrevealing about the actual process of second language acquisition.

A second type of study has come into existence in recent years. This type of study suggests that what is transferable may

not be restricted to surface syntactic phenomena such as preposition usage or grammatical inflection. Rather some more abstract, yet none the less salient characteristics of language, may be transferred. For instance, Rutherford (1983) suggests that transfer may be found in the area of language typology. He discusses three typological parameters. The first involves the positioning of the syntactic primes subject, verb, and object. Languages vary with respect to canonical arrangements. Tagalog is VSO, German is SVO, and Korean is SOV. The second parameter concerns the notion of subject-prominence and topic-prominence. English is a subject-prominent language, Chinese is a topic-prominent language, Japanese and Korean are reputed to be both subject and topic-prominent, while Tagalog is neither subject nor topic prominent. The third parameter concerns whether languages utilize word order to express grammatical relationships, as does English, or whether word order expresses pragmatic relationships such as theme-rheme distinctions, as does Russian.

Rutherford presents data which suggest that gross word orders do not transfer, but that topic/subject-prominence and pragmatic/grammatical word order do. The implications are clear. To focus only on surface syntax as a measure of language transfer is too restrictive.

This position is reflected in other studies. Gundel and Tarone (1983) investigate the acquisition of pronominal anaphora. Scarcella (1983) investigates such discourse functions as turn taking and granting, topic shift, hesitation phenomena, and fillers. The whole field of investigation known as "contrastive rhe-

toric" [see Kaplan (1966), (1983)] suggests that rhetorical patterns may be transferred.

To summarize our position, we wish to state that we find Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's hypothesis, that language transfer plays a minimal role in the acquisition of a second language, to be untenable. We state this because we do not believe that the evidence they present supports their position unambiguously. We do not claim that language transfer accounts for all of second language acquisition, nor do we claim that developmental processes play a minimal role in second language acquisition. We do claim that the issue is still unsettled and that the field is ripe for future explorations. We further believe that the issue is not whether language transfer exists, but in what ways it exists.

We see progress made in longitudinal studies such as Huebner (1979), (1983), where a comprehensive analysis of a single speaker is made. Morecver, we see promise in the investigation of areas outside the realm of pure syntax and morphology. Studies which incorporate typological features, sociological and discourse level phenomena, as well as nonverbal behaviors are all important.

We wish to make a final plea to investigators tc report to the English speaking audience results of the attempts at acquisition of languages other than English. In this respect, studies such as Jansen et al (1981), Koo and Hsu (1980), Jordens (1983) and Wode (1978), for the acquisition of Dutch, Japanese, and German, respectively, are extremely important. We urge investigators to delve into the acquisition of languages other than English.

References

d'Anglejan, Alison and G. Richard Tucker. 1967. The acquisition of complex English structures by adult learners. Language Learning 25:281-296.

Boyd, P. 1975. The development of grammar categories in Spanish by Anglo children learning a second language. Language Learning 25:125-36 [THIS IS AN INCORRECT CITATION GIVEN BY DULAY, BURT, AND KRASHEN].

Cancino, Herlinda E., Ellen J. Rosansky, and John Schumann. 1975. The acquisition of the English auxiliary by native Spanish speakers. TESOL Quarterly 9:421-30.

Clancy, Patricia. 1983. The acquisition of Japanese. Unpublished manuscript: Brown University.

Dulay, Heidi and Marina Burt. 1974a. Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly 8:129-136.

Dulay, Heidi and Marina Burt. 1974b. Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. Language Learning 24:37-53.

Dulay, Heidi, Marina Burt, and Stephen Krashen. 1982. Language two. NY: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1978. Is second language learning like the first? Second language acquisition, Evelyn Hatch (Ed.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Gass, Susan. 1983. Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. Language transfer in language learning, Susan Gass and Larry Selinker (Eds.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker (Eds.). 1983. Language transfer in

language learning. Rowley: Newbury House.

Gillis, May and Rose-Marie Weber. 1976. The emergence of sentence modalities in the English of Japanese-speaking children. Language Learning 26:77-94.

Gonzalez, P. and D. Elijah. 1979. Error patterns of bilingual readers. NABE Journal 3:3.15-25.

Gundel, Jeanette and Elaine Tarone. 1983. Language transfer and the acquisition of pronominal anaphora. Language transfer in language learning, Susan Gass and Larry Selinker (Eds.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Hanania, Edith and Harry Gradman. 1977. Acquisition of English structures: A case study of an adult native speaker of Arabic in an English-speaking environment. Language Learning 27:75-92.

Hansen-Bede, Lynne. 1975. A child's creation of a second language. Working Papers in Bilingualism, No. 6:103-23.

Huebner, Thom. 1979. Order-of-acquisition vs. dynamic paradigm: A comparison of method in interlanguage research. us TESOL Quarterly| 13:21-28.

Huebner, Thom. 1983. The acquisition of English: A longitudinal analysis. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc.

Jansen, Bert, Josien Lalleman, and Pieter Mieysken. 1981. The alternation hypothesis: Acquisition of Dutch word order by Turkish and Moroccan foreign workers. Language Learning 31:315-336.

Jordens, Peter. 1983. Discourse functions in interlanguage morphology. Language transfer in language learning, Susan Gass

and Larry Selinker (Eds.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Kaplan, Robert. 1966. Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning 16:1-20.

Kaplan, Robert (Ed.). 1983. Annual review of applied linguistics, 1982. Rowley: Newbury House.

Koo Hai-Keng and Hsu Chang-hua. 1980. Chuugokujin gakushuusha ni yoku mirareru goyoorei [Common errors made by Chinese students]. Nihongo Kyooiku 41:47-60.

LoCoco, Veronica. 1975. An analysis of Spanish and German learner's errors. Working Papers on Bilingualism 7:96-124.

LoCoco, Veronica. 1976. A comparison of three methods for the collection of L2 data: free composition, translation and picture description. Working Papers on Bilingualism 8:59-86.

Milon, John. 1974. The development of negation in English by a second language learner. TESOL Quarterly 8:137-43.

Price, E. 1968. Early bilingualism. Towards bilingualism, D. Dodson, E. Price, and L. Williams (Eds.). Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Rutherford, William. 1983. Language typology and language transfer. Language transfer in language learning, Susan Gass and Larry Selinker (Eds.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Scarcella, Robin. 1983. Discourse accent in second language performance. Language transfer in language learning, Susan Gass and Larry Selinker (Eds.). Rowley: Newbury House.

Scott, Margaret Sue and G. Richard Tucker. 1974. Error analysis and English language strategies of Arab students. Language Learning 24:69-98.

Valdman, A. 1974. Error analysis and pedagogical ordering. Reproduced by Linguistic Agency University at Trier, D-55 Trier, West Germany.

Venable, G. 1975. Error analysis and pedagogical ordering. Some implications of linguistic theory for applied linguistics, S. P. Corder and E. Roulet (Eds.). Paris: Didier.

White, Lydia. 1977. Error analysis and error correction in adult learners of English as a second language. Working Papers in Bilingualism 13:42-58.

Wode, Henning. 1978. Developmental sequences in naturalistic L2 acquisition. Second Language Acquisition, Evelyn Hatch (Ed.). Rowley: Newbury House.